

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 8, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCammon et al (US 4,556,772; hereinafter "McCammon") in view of JP 63174296A. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 1, neither McCammon nor JP 63174296A, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that a distance between a center of the opening area of the electricity feeding port and an antenna of the magnetron is $g/2$ multiplied by an integer, wherein g is a wavelength of the microwave propagated at an inside of the waveguides, and that an inclined face is formed at a connecting portion between the upper waveguide and the side waveguide. Supports for the amendment are found in page 10, lines 20-28 of the original specification, and Figure 1.

McCammon is silent about a relationship between the above distance and the wavelength of the microwave. Also, no inclined face is formed at a connecting portion between the upper waveguide (34a) and the side waveguide (34b) in McCammon.

JP 63174296A is silent about a relationship between the above distance and the wavelength of the microwave. Also, because the microwave disclosed in JP 63174296A does not have a side waveguide, JP 63174296A does not disclose the above connecting portion.

Accordingly, the combination of McCammon and JP 63174296A does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of McCammon and JP 63174296A does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to claim 12. The other rejected claims are dependent from either claims 1 or 12, and therefore the same argument will apply to these claims.

In addition, regarding claim 8, neither McCammon nor JP 63174296A, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that a heating member is mounted to the ceiling wall of the heating chamber. The Office action states that JP 63174296A also discloses a heating member is mounted to the ceiling wall of the heating chamber (12). However, according to Figure 2 of JP 63174296A, the heating member (18) is not mounted to the ceiling wall (14) of the heating chamber (13), but is mounted to the side walls of the heating chamber (13).

Also, regarding claim 11, neither McCammon nor JP 63174296A, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the heating member is positioned such that a horizontal centerline of the heating member is located above the opening areas of the plurality of feeding ports. According to Figure 2 of JP 63174296A, the heating member (18) is not located above the opening areas of the plurality of feeding ports (17, 17), but below the opening areas of the plurality of feeding ports (17, 17).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCammon in view of JP 63174296A, and further in view of JP 62100982A or Smith (US 3,210,511). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 2. For the same reason as claim 1, claim 2 should be allowable. JP 62100982A or Smith is merely cited for the arrangement of the antenna.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCammon in view of JP 63174296A, and further in view of Noda et al (JP05074568a; hereinafter "Noda"). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 9. For the same reason as claim 1, claim 9 should be allowable. Noda is merely cited for the inclination of the heating member.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCammon in view of JP 63174296A, and further in view of DeRemer (US 4,307,285). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 15 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 15. For the same reason as claim 1, claim 15 should be allowable. DeRemer is merely cited for the arrangement of the heating member in a recessed portion of the ceiling wall of the heating chamber.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCammon in view of JP 63174296A, and further in view of Miller (US 4,463,239). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 17 is dependent from claim 12. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 12 are included in claim 17. For the same reason as claim 12, claim 17 should be allowable. Miller is merely cited for the width of the waveguide.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/539,109
Amdt. Dated: September 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to
our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-38340.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 22, 2009